

REMARKS

The Official Action of January 12, 2006, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied.

The status of the claims is as follows:

(a) Claims 2-3, 6, 10-13, 24-25, 28, 32, 38-39, 42, and 46-49 are as originally filed.

(b) Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 14, 16-19, 23, 26-27, 30-31, 33, 35, 37, 40-41, 44-45, 50, 52-55, and 59-70 have been currently amended.

(c) Claims 7, 22, 29, 36, 43, and 58 were previously canceled without prejudice, and claims 15, 20-21, 34, 51, and 56-57 have been currently canceled without prejudice.

(d) Claims 1-6, 8-14, 16-19, 23-28, 30-33, 35, 37-42, 44-50, 52-55 and 59-70 remain in the application for consideration.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiners Caldwell and Lin for the courtesy of a personal interview with Applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856), held in the USPTO on March 8, 2006. Claim 15 was discussed at the

interview. Mr. Colb suggested directing the claims to the embodiment exemplified in Figs. 3A-C. Mr. Colb proposed claim language including the "propagation history superimposed as a pathway on a chart." As exemplified in Figs. 3A-C, such a "chart" is not solely a textual representation. The Examiner suggested that upon a cursory review, the references applied in the last office action do not appear to teach the features discussed during the interview.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Bates et al.**

Claims 1-3, 11-21, 23-25, 32-35, 37-39, and 47-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bates '107. The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 23, and 37 to include the additional feature discussed at the interview that the propagation history is displayed "superimposed as a pathway on a chart." This amendment finds support at least in Figs. 3B and 3C of the present application as filed, in which arrows 180, 182 and 184 (Fig. 3B; p. 15, lines 20-21) and arrows 190, 192, and 194 (Fig. 3C; p. 16, lines 18-19) show the pathway of the propagation history superimposed on chart 120 (p. 16, line 14). The Applicant has also amended these claims to include a feature similar to that of claims 15, 34, and 51 as originally filed, that the chart "show[s] a relationship among at least some of: the sender and the one or more recipients." This feature is also supported

in Figs. 3B and 3C, in which chart 120 shows a relationship among at least some of the sender and the one or more recipients. In contrast, Bates neither describes, shows, nor suggests such a superimposition. The Applicant thus submits that claims 1, 23, and 37 are in a condition for allowance. In view of the patentability of independent claims 1, 23, and 37, the Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-3, 11-14, 16-19, 24-28, 30-33, 35, 38-42, 44-50, 52-55, and 59-70 are also allowable, because they depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 23, and 37, respectively.

Because the features of dependent claims 15, 20-21, 34, 51, and 56-57 have now been included in independent claims 1, 23, and 37, the Applicant has canceled these dependent claims and made conforming amendments to claims 16-19, 35, 52-55, 62, and 70, which originally depended directly or indirectly from claims 15, 34, 51, 20, and 56, respectively. In addition, claims 14, 33, 50, 59-61, 63-65, and 66-69 have been currently amended to make conforming amendments, including updating antecedent basis, in light of the amendments to claims 1, 23, and 37. No new matter has been added.

Appln. No. 10/035,423  
Amd. dated April 11, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2006

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)***

Claims 4-5, 26-27, and 40-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates '107 in view of Smith '462. Claims 6, 8-10, 28, 30-31, 42, and 44-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Smith, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2002/0087679 to Pulley et al. Claims 59-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Smith in view of Pulley, and further in view of Wanderski '687.

***Statement of common ownership for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)***

The Applicant respectfully traverses the above-mentioned rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of claims 4-6, 8-10, 26-28, 30-31, 40-42, 44-46, and 59-70. The present application and the application that issued as the Bates patent were commonly owned by the same person (International Business Machines Corporation) at the time the claimed invention of the present application was made. The Bates patent issued after the January 4, 2002 filing date of the present application, and thus is available as potential prior art against the present application only under 35 U.S. 102(e). Therefore, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 103(c), the Bates patent is not available under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as potential prior art against the present application. Consequently, claims 4-6, 8-

10, 26-28, 30-31, 40-42, 44-46, and 59-70 recite allowable subject matter.

The Applicant has amended claims 4-5 and 8-9 to include the elements of the respective independent claims from which these claims depended, and the elements of any intervening claims. Claims 6 and 10 depend from claims 5 and 9, respectively. Claims 4-6 and 8-10 are thus in a condition for allowance. Although, as mentioned above, dependent claims 26-28, 30-31, 40-42, 44-46, and 59-70 also recited allowable subject matter, the Applicant has left these claims in dependent form, in order to avoid additional excess claim fees. In light of the suggested allowability of the independent claims from which these claims directly or indirectly depend, as mentioned above, these claims are in a condition for allowance.

The Applicant notes that the Applicant's statement of common ownership has now been placed in a conspicuously labeled section in order to comply with the formal requirements of MPEP 706.02(1)(2), as required by the Examiner.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 8-9 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 because they depend from deleted claims 7 and 23, respectively. As discussed above, claims 8-9 have been recast

as independent claims, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to these claims. The dependencies of claims 30-31 have been amended in light of the previous cancellation of claim 29. In addition, the dependencies of claims 44-45 have been amended in light of the previous cancellation of claim 43. The Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are now in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By

  
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\NC\colb\RIBAK2\PTO\Amd 11April06.doc